

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30. Claims 6, 8, 9, 25, and 28 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. As a result, claims 1, 6–9, 11, 13, 14, 25–28, and 30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 6, and 25 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Canon Kabushiki Kaisha (European Patent Application EP1205843A) (“Canon”) and Walbeck et al (US Patent No. 7,310,670) (“Walbeck”) and Kageyama et al (US Patent No. 5,625,757) (“Kageyama”). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 6–8, 11, 13, 14, 25–27, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Canon and Walbeck. Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejections. Even so, the Applicants have amended some of the claims to further recite the features of the invention.

Reply

Application Number: 10/804,619  
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

Claim 1 calls for:

“...a client that interfaces with an applications program, the client including a client print spooler; a server including a server print spooler,... wherein the print requests are communicated via a first asynchronous communications channel established between the client print spooler and the server print spooler;...” (underlining and bolding added for emphasis.)

Claim 6 has been amended to call for:

“...a client including a client print spooler...” (underlining added for emphasis.)

Claim 25 has been amended to call for:

“...wherein the client includes a client print spooler;...” (underlining added for emphasis.)

The Examiner suggests that, “the use of print spoolers in a client/server printing environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made (see Kageyama Figure 3 and column 16 lines 35–41”. Further, the Examiner suggests that, “Canon teaches the use of a printer connected to a client/server environment (see Canon paragraph [0009]...)”. Finally, the Examiner states, “It would have been obvious

Reply

Application Number: 10/804,619  
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide print spooling as taught by Kageyama in the client/server printing environment taught by Canon/Walbeck so that changes made to a document while it is being printed will not interrupt the printing process.” (See OA, pg. 13)

Even so (arguendo), neither Kageyama nor Canon nor Walbeck, alone or together, disclose, teach, or suggest the Applicants’ claimed features: a “client including a client print spooler”, a “server including a server print spooler”, and communicating print requests via an asynchronous channel between the client print spooler and the server print spooler. In particular, FIGs. 3 and 4 of Kageyama show a client that clearly does not include a client print server. Kageyama seems to only discuss “print spoolers” in connection with printer server 300 of FIG. 3 which is a server and not a client. Further, neither Canon nor Walbeck teach a spooler of any type.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 6, and 25 are not anticipated by Canon under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), even in view of Walbeck and/or Kageyama. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are dependent on one of claims 1, 6, and 25. As such, claims 7–9, 11, 13, 14, 26–28, and 30 are believed allowable at least in part based upon claim 1, 6, or 25.

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

Reply  
Application Number: 10/804,619  
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: May 6, 2008  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

By: /L. Alan Collins/  
L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646  
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

May 6, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Reply  
Application Number: 10/804,619  
Attorney Docket Number: 306473.01